

Historic, Archive Document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

AS 21
A8451
Copy 2

28



United States
Department of
Agriculture

Office of
Public Affairs

Selected Speeches and News Releases

November 7 - November 13, 1991

IN THIS ISSUE:

Statement —

by Secretary of Agriculture Edward R. Madigan, before the Twenty-Sixth Session of the Conference of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Rome Italy, Nov. 12.

News Releases—

USDA Announces Prevailing World Market Price and User Marketing Certificate Payment Rate for Upland Cotton

USDA Quarantines Portions of Three California Counties for Fruit Flies

USDA Announces 1991-Crop Contracted Peanut Poundage

USDA Changes Payment Mechanism for EEP and DEIP

President's Council on Rural America to Hold Hearing in Santa Fe

Scientists Identify Fungus Attacking Texas-Grown Cantaloupe

USDA to Expand Partnership With 1890 Land Grant Institutions

USDA Updates Grain Scale Regulations

USDA to Change Estimating Program for Selected Oilseeds

USDA Announces Final Results of 10th Conservation Reserve Program Signup

Statement

U.S. Department of Agriculture • Office of Public Affairs

by Secretary of Agriculture Edward R. Madigan, before the Twenty-Sixth Session of the Conference of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Rome Italy, Nov. 12.

Mr. Director-General, fellow delegates and friends.

We are entering a new and challenging period for world agriculture. It is fair to say that agriculture now plays a pivotal role in the political and economic changes sweeping the globe.

—The peoples of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union are fighting to free themselves from the vestiges of communism and build strong private sector economies. Agriculture is crucial for their success. If agriculture fails them in the next few years, we may soon see renewed threats to their experiment in freedom.

—The people of Africa continue to struggle to feed themselves against a backdrop of widespread war and civil unrest. Tens of millions of Africans live precariously, poised on the brink of starvation. If African agriculture does not help meet this challenge, we can forget the promising political and social reforms now surfacing all over the continent.

—At the global level, we all face an even broader challenge. After 5 years of negotiations, the world still awaits the conclusion of the Uruguay Round of the GATT. Again, agriculture is crucial. If we can come to an agreement on agriculture, the Uruguay Round can and will succeed.

Despite the tremendous importance of agriculture in world commerce and politics, many countries still view all agricultural issues through the narrow prism of their own self-interest. No country is blameless on that score. It is time for us to move beyond that. It is time we all accept that we have a world agricultural system and act accordingly.

What an American farmer plants in Iowa, may help or hurt a farmer's income in Poland. An Argentine wheat farmer's profits may hinge on the EC Common Agricultural Policy and the plantings of a farmer in France. A Thai rice farmer's future may ultimately depend on a political decision made in Japan. Farmers in small nations become the unintended victims of subsidy battles among their larger neighbors.

The failure to find cooperative solutions to production and trade problems within this world system costs taxpayers and consumers in the OECD countries alone \$300 billion a year. And those who can afford it least—the farmers in developing countries—lose \$26 billion in income each year because of export subsidies, protectionism, and other trade distorting measures. In 1991 no nation can pretend that its production and trade decisions exist in isolation, that these decisions do not deeply affect the well-being of its neighbors.

What can we do to begin a new era of world cooperation in agriculture?

First and foremost, we must come to an agreement on agriculture in the Uruguay Round. Eastern Europe will not thrive if its denied access to the markets of its neighbors. The farmers of the developing countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America will never climb from poverty if they cannot sell their products freely on world markets.

Agriculture is not the only area of contention in the Uruguay Round, but it is the most crucial. The developing nations have said they will not make concessions in areas of interest to more developed nations—areas such as intellectual property rights and services—unless there is a good agreement in agriculture, the sector they depend on most for export earnings.

The United States strongly endorses the views of the developing countries on this issue. President Bush has made it clear that a Uruguay Round agreement must address the issues of market access, export subsidies and trade-distorting internal supports in agriculture.

The United States has put all policies on the table. The resolve of the Bush Administration to come to a good agreement has never been stronger. We are ready to negotiate significant reductions in market access barriers and expect the same from our trading partners. We recognize the need for transition mechanisms for all parties, especially developing countries, allowing for the phased reduction of tariffs and special safeguards to protect against sudden import surges and price drops.

The technical talks on agriculture ended last month. That part of the process was very thorough and productive. Now we must make the tough policy decisions.

Recent signs of movement and flexibility, particularly on the part of our German and French colleagues here in Europe, give me new optimism about the future of the Uruguay Round. I believe that with

some hard work we will have the framework for an agreement in agriculture by the end of this year.

A successful Uruguay Round can ensure that all nations share the opportunity to trade and prosper economically. But for the poorest nations, that will not be enough. We have to offer them our support through technical assistance, training and research so they have the tools to produce and the capacity to take advantage of new opportunities in world trade.

The United States has moved to improve the efficiency and focus of its aid programs. Last year we rewrote the legislation for one of our leading aid programs—Food For Peace. As a result we expect to increase the proportion of food aid given on a grant basis. In addition, the President has new authority to forgive indebtedness that he is using to ease the debt burdens of the poorest countries in sub-Saharan Africa and Latin America.

The United States remains a strong advocate of food aid through the United Nations. I am proud to inform you that our contribution to the regular and emergency operations of the World Food Program this biennium has climbed more than 40 percent. We will soon break the half billion dollar mark, an historic record. We look to WFP to continue its fine work in bringing food and hope into the lives of tens of millions of the world's poor and malnourished.

As evidence of our deep commitment to WFP, the United States has offered a candidate to succeed James Ingram as head of the Program—Assistant Secretary Catherine Bertini. We appreciate the support she has received from many countries represented here. We are confident she would be a dedicated, compassionate, and effective Executive Director.

Agriculture continues to take a leading place in U.S. international aid and we now spend \$1 billion a year on this type of assistance. We are giving high priority to helping developing nations strengthen their private sector; funding microenterprises, particularly those run by women; and spurring private U.S. investment in agriculture in developing countries.

We continue to support a vast network of agricultural research and scientific exchanges that spans the globe, so American scientists can pool their talents with their counterparts here in Europe India, Egypt, and many nations in the developing world.

The rapid pace of political and economic change poses particular challenges for FAO. I call on FAO, with the leadership of the Director-General and his staff, to seize the initiative:

First, find ways to help nations make the transition to free market economies. The welfare of the peoples of Eastern Europe, the Soviet Union, and Africa depends on making that transition a success.

Second, press for a quick and positive outcome to the Uruguay Round. Then help developing countries and Eastern Europe take advantage of the opening in world markets.

Third, work to strike a sound balance between the need for development and the need to preserve the environment in forestry, fisheries and agriculture programs. I know that is no easy task. We struggle with this same issue in the United States. People must be fed, but they will not be fed for long if we damage the environment in the process.

In sum, we are looking to FAO to become an innovator in a time of fundamental political and economic change. We are pleased by signs that FAO is moving in that direction. We welcome the Director-General's support for the Uruguay Round of the GATT and urge him to continue and expand these activities.

We look to FAO to play a more active role in fostering international trade in the years ahead. By expanding the scope and effectiveness of the Codex Alimentarius and the International Plant Protection Convention, we can prevent artificial barriers to trade that are not based on genuine scientific standards. We believe these two activities should have a high profile within the organization.

We encourage FAO to help the developing countries become more involved in the Codex Alimentarius. Through policy advice and its Technical Cooperation Program, FAO can strengthen knowledge in developing countries on food quality and safety issues as they relate to trade. We encourage greater attention to this area, where FAO can serve the interests of developing and developed countries alike.

The United States appreciates the work FAO has done to gather and upgrade data for the World Agricultural Information Center (WAICENT). We are also looking forward to the International Conference on Nutrition co-sponsored by FAO and the World Health Organization (WHO). We view this Conference as an opportunity to agree on concrete measures on a wide range of problems, from the micronutrient deficiency diseases that scar the lives of millions of children, to broader international agreements on food safety and quality and nutritional labeling for food products.

This year the United States joined FAO's Commission on Plant Genetic Resources. The Commission is addressing important questions on plant

genetic resources that will have a direct bearing on our ability to meet the growing demand for food in the years ahead. Issues such as intellectual property rights with respect to genetic resources are not easy to resolve, but we look to FAO to play a central role in this process.

We are very pleased to see that FAO has begun to carry out recommendations from the review of its programs. We look forward to more progress this biennium, especially in ensuring that:

- field projects are sustainable, effective and environmentally sound, and focus on areas where FAO has a comparative advantage technically;
- the role of women as agricultural producers and consumers is considered in all aspects of FAO's work; and,
- coordination with other UN agencies and bilateral donors is strengthened.

In addition, during this Conference the United States looks forward to beginning a dialogue with other members and the Secretariat on how we can streamline our working methods and decisionmaking in FAO's governing bodies and technical committees.

Like so many of its member governments, FAO will be asked to do more with less. Virtually every major contributor to FAO is facing a government budget deficit this year. Some are quite severe. The governments of other member nations are striving to live with strict fiscal austerity measures. For this reason, the United States must oppose special assessments and we call on our fellow member nations to seek a final FAO program of work and budget for 1992-93 with maximum absorption of nondiscretionary cost increases.

The United States is pleased by the actions the Director-General has taken so far to curb cost increases and to achieve no real growth in programs. From my own experience at the Department of Agriculture, I know first-hand how difficult this task can be.

The United States also commends the Director-General for his support as we seek to make the early submission of a budget outline a permanent feature of FAO's budget process at this Conference.

To underscore the United States' interest in lessening the financial difficulties facing FAO, we expedited our last payment as soon as we received the Congressional appropriation for fiscal year 1992. I am pleased to notify the membership of a U.S. payment of nearly \$50 million in October, including a \$13.7 million payment toward our arrears. These funds, along with additional substantial payments in the event we join consensus on the budget, could help restore FAO's financial base.

In closing I would like to note that support for the United Nations and its specialized agencies has grown in the United States in recent years. Increasingly, the American people recognize that the United Nations can be a valuable instrument for promoting democracy and needed political and economic change. Dedicated to ending hunger and building economic opportunity worldwide, FAO has a crucial role to play in the United Nations system.

President Bush is personally committed to repaying the arrears the United States owes to United Nations agencies, including FAO, and he has made this a budgetary priority. Pending Congressional appropriation, we plan to make these payments over the next few years.

FAO can do much to foster a new era of cooperation in agriculture. But it is up to each member country to help. We cannot ask FAO to be innovative, if we are not innovative ourselves.

Mr. Director-General, you have my pledge that the United States will help FAO meet the challenges that face world agriculture. In Africa, in Eastern Europe, in every quarter of the globe, those challenges intensify each day. Let's work together to meet them.

#

News Releases

U.S. Department of Agriculture • Office of Public Affairs

USDA ANNOUNCES PREVAILING WORLD MARKET PRICE AND USER MARKETING CERTIFICATE PAYMENT RATE FOR UPLAND COTTON

WASHINGTON, Nov. 7—John Stevenson, acting executive vice president of USDA's Commodity Credit Corporation, today announced the prevailing world market price, adjusted to U.S. quality and location (adjusted world price), for Strict Low Middling (SLM) 1-1/16 inch (micronaire 3.5-3.6 and 4.3-4.9, strength 24-25 grams per tex) upland cotton (base quality), the coarse count adjustment and the user marketing certificate payment rate in effect from 12:01 a.m. Friday, Nov. 8, through midnight Thursday, Nov. 14.

The Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, provides that the adjusted world price (AWP) may be further adjusted if: (a) the AWP is less than 115 percent of the current crop year loan rate for base quality upland cotton, and (b) the Friday through Thursday average price quotation for the lowest-priced U.S. growth as quoted for Middling (M) 1-3/32 inch cotton, C.I.F. northern Europe (U.S. Northern Europe price) exceeds the Northern Europe price. The maximum allowable adjustment is the difference between the U.S. Northern Europe price and the Northern Europe price.

Based on data for the week ending Nov. 7, a further adjustment to this week's calculated AWP may be made in accordance with this provision. The calculated AWP is 96.10 percent of the 1991 upland cotton base quality loan rate, and the U.S. Northern Europe price exceeds the Northern Europe price by 2.23 cents per pound. Below are the relevant calculations.

I.	Calculated AWP	48.79 cents per pound
	1991 Base Loan Rate	50.77 cents per pound
	AWP as a Percent of Loan Rate	96.10
II.	U.S. Northern Europe Price	67.40 cents per pound
	Northern Europe Price	-65.17 cents per pound
	Maximum Adjustment Allowed	2.23 cents per pound

Based on a consideration of the U.S. share of world exports, the current level of cotton export sales and cotton export shipments, and other relevant data, a further adjustment to this week's calculated AWP will not be made.

Based on data for the week ending Nov. 7, the AWP for base quality upland cotton and the coarse count adjustment are determined as follows:

Adjusted World Price

Northern Europe Price	65.17
Adjustments:	
Average U.S. spot market location	14.13
SLM 1-1/16 inch cotton	1.90
Average U.S. location	0.35
Sum of Adjustments	-16.38
Calculated AWP	-48.79
Further AWP adjustment	- 0
ADJUSTED WORLD PRICE	48.79 cents/lb.

Coarse Count Adjustment

Northern Europe Price	65.17
Northern Europe Coarse Count Price	-62.07
	3.10
Adjustment to SLM 1-1/32 inch cotton	-4.20
	-1.10

COARSE COUNT ADJUSTMENT 0 cents/lb.

Because this week's AWP is below both the 1990 and 1991 base quality loan rates of 50.27 and 50.77 cents per pound, respectively, the loan repayment rate during this period is equal to the AWP, adjusted for the specific quality and location plus applicable interest and storage charges on the 1990 crop.

The AWP will continue to be used to determine the value of upland cotton that is obtained in exchange for commodity certificates. Because the AWP in effect during this period is below the 1991-crop loan rate, cash loan deficiency payments will be paid to eligible producers who agree to forgo obtaining a price support loan with respect to their 1991 crop. The payment rate is equal to the difference between the loan rate and the AWP. Producers

Based on data for the week ending Nov. 7, the U.S. Northern Europe price exceeded the Northern Europe price by more than 1.25 cents per

pound for the fourth consecutive week, resulting in a certificate payment rate of 0.98 cents per pound. Relevant data used in determining the user marketing certificate payment rate are summarized below:

Week	For the Friday through Thursday Period Ending	U.S.	Northern		
		Northern Europe Price (1)	Northern Europe Price (2)	(1) Minus (2)	Certificate Payment Rate ¹
..... cents per pound					
1	Oct. 17, 1991	70.75	68.05	2.70	145
2	Oct. 24, 1991	69.70	67.48	2.22	0.97
3	Oct. 31, 191	68.90	66.63	2.27	1.02
4	Nov. 7, 1991	67.40	65.17	2.23	0.98

¹(1) minus (2) for Week 4 minus 1.25 cents.

The next announcement of the AWP, coarse count adjustment and user marketing certificate payment rate will be made on Thursday, Nov. 14.

Charles Cunningham (202) 720-7954

#

USDA QUARANTINES PORTIONS OF THREE CALIFORNIA COUNTIES FOR FRUIT FLIES

WASHINGTON, Nov. 12—The U.S. Department of Agriculture has quarantined 46 square miles of Los Angeles County, Calif., after finding six Mediterranean fruit flies in the Country Club Park area.

An additional 152 square miles, covering portions of Los Angles, Riverside and San Berdardino counties, also were quarantined after 38 Oriental fruit flies were found there.

“The quarantines are designed to prevent the spread of these flies,” said B. Glen Lee, deputy administrator for plant protection and quarantinc with USDA’s Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service. “Our action prohibits the interstate movement of certain fruits and vegetables out of the infested areas unless they have been certified by an agricultural inspector.”

Both types of flies are extremely destructive, attacking more than 200 kinds of fruits and vegetables. If permanently established in the United States, these pests would seriously limit the export market for U.S. produce.

Lee said APHIS and the California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA) have stepped up trapping efforts in the infested areas to monitor for the presence additional fruit flies. In addition, the CDFA has begun applying ground applications of malathion bait to the areas surrounding the Medfly finds.

Interim rules establishing the quarantines became effective upon signature on Nov. 5, and will be published in the Nov. 13 Federal Register. Comments will be accepted if they are received on or before Jan. 13, 1992. An original and three copies of written comments referring to docket no. 91-155 (medflies) or docket no. 91-149 (Oriental fruit flies) should be sent to Chief, Regulatory Analysis and Development, PPD, APHIS, USDA, Room 804, Federal Building, 6505 Belcrest Road, Hyattsville, Md. 20782.

Comments may be inspected at USDA, Room 1141-S, 14th St. and Independence Ave., S.W., Washington, D.C., between 8 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, except holidays.

Doug Hendrix (301) 436-7253

#

USDA ANNOUNCES 1991-CROP CONTRACTED PEANUT POUNDAGE

WASHINGTON, Nov. 12—The U.S. Department of Agriculture's Commodity Credit Corporation today released figures that show the quantity of peanuts under purchase contracts for the 1991 crop is 1,960,889,856 pounds, or 980,445 short tons.

The final quantity of peanuts delivered under these contracts depend upon actual peanut production and the terms under which handlers and producers have agreed to deliver contracted peanuts.

By growing area, the quantities are:

Southeast 1,315,049,516 pounds
Southwest 489,141,354 pounds
Virginia/Carolina 156,698,986 pounds

John Ryan (202) 720-8207.

#

USDA CHANGES PAYMENT MECHANISM FOR EEP AND DEIP

WASHINGTON, Nov. 6—The U.S. Department of Agriculture's Commodity Credit Corporation will begin paying bonuses under the Export Enhancement Program and the Dairy Export Incentive Program in cash, according to CCC Executive Vice President Keith Bjerke.

This change will apply to agreements resulting from offers received by CCC after 3 p.m. today. CCC bonuses for agreements resulting from offers received by CCC prior to 3 p.m. today will be paid in generic commodity certificates, and these agreements will not be affected by this announcement.

The action is being taken to ensure that CCC retains sufficient stocks to cover the generic commodity certificates that already have been issued under the EEP and DEIP and to meet other commitments, Bjerke said.

This change will affect only the form of the CCC bonus. Payments to exporters will continue to be issued by the Kansas City Commodity Office and exporters should continue to submit required shipment documents to the offices specified in the EEP and DEIP regulations and the "Notice to Exporters—EEP Contacts."

For further information, call the CCC Operations Division at (202) 720-5540.

Sally Klusaritz (202) 720-3448

#

PRESIDENT'S COUNCIL ON RURAL AMERICA TO HOLD HEARING IN SANTA FE

WASHINGTON, Nov. 13—The President's Council on Rural America will hold a public hearing with state and local leaders Nov. 14 in Santa Fe, N.M., to discuss economic development in rural regions in the state and around the country.

The hearing is the seventh in a series by the council to elicit public input in rural development policymaking.

At the hearing (to be held from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. Nov. 14 at the Hilton of Sante Fe, 100 Sandoval Street, in Sante Fe), council members will hear from state and local government officials, as well as farm, business, and education leaders. The hearing will examine rural development policies and ways to strengthen and diversify local economies.

The council advises President Bush on rural development policy and provides guidance to federal agencies in implementing policy at the national level. The council was established in 1990 under the president's Rural Economic Development Initiative for the 90's. Its members are farmers, state and local government officials, and rural business and industry leaders.

Council Chairman Winthrop P. Rockefeller said the hearing is important because members are receiving direct feedback from state and local leaders about rural development problems and solutions.

“National policy can be effective only if it addresses problems at the local level, and supports local initiatives in solving those problems,” Rockefeller said.

Under Secretary of Agriculture Roland R. Vautour said the council helps coordinate federal, state, regional and local efforts to diversify rural economies.

“Effective policies supporting rural economic diversification are key to revitalization of many rural areas,” Vautour said. “The council's examination of local-level problems sharpens the federal government's ability to support local solutions. The issues that come before the council include infrastructure, community leadership, environmental issues, health, education, housing, technology, trade development and tourism.”

The U.S. Department of Agriculture provides support to the council in cooperation with all of the federal agencies in the Economic Policy

Council's Working Group on Rural Development, a permanent cabinet-level working group established to coordinate the President's Initiative on Rural Economic Development.

Arthur Whitmore (202) 720-4026

#

SCIENTISTS IDENTIFY FUNGUS ATTACKING TEXAS-GROWN CANTALOUPE

WASHINGTON, Nov. 13,—A mystery fungus that struck cantaloupe plants in southern Texas over the last five years has been tracked down by U.S. Department of Agriculture and Texas A&M University scientists.

Spores of the fungus look like black, microscopic cannonballs. They are responsible for much of the cantaloupe losses in Texas' lower Rio Grande Valley since 1986, the scientists say. In some cases, yields are down as much as 50 percent or more.

Benny D. Bruton of USDA's Agricultural Research Service, Lane, Okla., and Texas A&M scientists Ray D. Martyn, College Station, and Marvin E. Miller, Weslaco, and Texas A&M graduate student Jim C. Mertely, College Station, cooperated in identifying the fungus.

Mertely isolated and identified the fungus, which was confirmed by an ARS laboratory at Beltsville, Md. The fungus, *Monosporascus cannonballus*, causes a discoloration and rot of cantaloupe roots, stunting of vines and premature dying of leaves. Fruit from diseased plants are unmarketable due to smaller size, lower sugar content and scalding by the sun.

Cantaloupes—also known as muskmelons—are grown on 25,000 acres in the lower Rio Grande Valley. Current control methods such as fungicide spraying are ineffective against the fungus, the scientists say, adding that research on fumigants is promising.

Cantaloupes belong to the cucurbit plant family. According to the scientists, other members of the same plant family including watermelon, cucumber, squash and pumpkin “are susceptible to the pathogen as well.”

There had been only one other report of the fungus in the United States—in Arizona in 1970—before the scientists were able to point an accusing finger at the fungus as the primary cause of disease in the Rio-Grande Valley-grown cantaloupe.

Tracking down the fungus as the main culprit was tricky, say the scientists. That's because *M. cannonballus* is only one of a number of harmful fungi that colonize decaying cantaloupe roots, and its presence is often masked by other fungi.

Jan Suszkiw/Sean Adams (301) 344-3108

#

USDA TO EXPAND PARTNERSHIP WITH 1890 LAND GRANT INSTITUTIONS

WASHINGTON, Nov. 13—Strong partnership efforts between the U.S. Department of Agriculture and 17 predominantly black colleges and universities must continue, Charles R. Hilty, associate deputy secretary of agriculture, said today in keynote remarks opening a two-day symposium here.

Officials of the 17 1890 Land Grant Institutions and USDA are meeting to analyze progress made since the partnership was forged at a similar symposium in Nashville, Tenn., in 1988, and to plan the next steps needed to strengthen the universities.

Hilty said USDA needs a strong partnership with the 17 predominantly black colleges and universities to meet the agricultural challenges and opportunities of the next century, including that of a diverse workforce.

The first USDA/1890s symposium resulted in several recommendations to strengthen the partnership between USDA and the 1890 Institutions. Hilty said significant progress has been made toward implementing those recommendations. He cited the establishment of USDA offices staffed with USDA liaisons at each of the 17 campuses; increased USDA funding to the 1890s, including a capacity building grants program; a summer intern program for 1890s students, and greatly increased use of the federal excess personal property program for the 1890s.

He said the goals of this symposium are to develop specific strategies and recommendations to further enhance the 1890 colleges and universities and expand their involvement in the delivery of USDA programs, and to increase the number of minority students majoring in agricultural sciences, forestry and related fields.

“Finding ways to increase agricultural exports, developing new uses for agricultural products, solving environmental problems and providing sound nutritional education for all citizens are just a few of the

challenges and opportunities which face us,” Hilty said. “The agricultural community needs the creative and innovative talents of a diverse workforce to successfully meet them. A strong partnership with the 1890 Institutions will help provide that diversity.”

The 17 colleges and universities, known collectively as the 1890 Institutions from the 1890 Morrill Act which authorized states to establish black land grant colleges and universities, are: Alabama A&M, Huntsville; Alcorn State University, Lorman, Miss.; University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff; Delaware State College, Dover; Florida A&M University, Tallahassee; Fort Valley State College, Fort Valley, Ga.; Kentucky State University, Frankfort; Langston University, Langston, Okla.; Lincoln University, Jefferson City, Mo.; University of Maryland-Eastern Shore, Princess Anne; North Carolina A&T State University, Greensboro; Prairie View A&M University, Prairie View, Texas; South Carolina State College, Orangeburg; Southern University and A&M College, Baton Rouge, La.; Tennessee State University, Nashville; Tuskegee University, Tuskegee, Ala., and Virginia State University, Petersburg.

Diane O'Connor (202) 720-4026

Leslie Parker (202) 720-4026

#

USDA UPDATES GRAIN SCALE REGULATIONS

WASHINGTON, Nov. 13—The U.S. Department of Agriculture’s Federal Grain Inspection Service is incorporating the applicable requirements for grain-weighing equipment of the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) 1990 Handbook 44 and all sections of NIST Handbook 105-1 into USDA grain inspection regulations.

FGIS regulations currently contain, by reference, applicable requirements from the 1988 edition of Handbook 44 and the 1972 edition of Handbook 105-1. This action will update the regulations using the current handbooks as references.

John C. Foltz, FGIS administrator, said the changes are part of the agency’s continuing review and update of its regulations, to ensure they serve their intended purposes and are consistent with FGIS policy and authority.

This final rule was published in the Nov. 4 Federal Register, and will become effective Dec. 4.

Dana Stewart (202) 720-5091

#

USDA TO CHANGE ESTIMATING PROGRAM FOR SELECTED OILSEEDS

WASHINGTON, Nov. 13—The U.S. Department of Agriculture's National Agricultural Statistics Service will expand its oilseed estimating program starting in January 1992. NASS Administrator Charles Caudill announced the following changes to comply with the 1990 Farm Act:

—U.S. end-of-season planted and harvested acreage, yield and production estimates for canola, rapeseed, safflower and mustard seed will be added to the Crop Production, Annual Summary, released Jan. 13. Mid-year estimates of acreages planted to these crops will be carried in the June 30 Acreage report.

—An "all other States" category will be added to the flaxseed and sunflower end-of-season estimates in the Crop Production, Annual Summary.

—U.S. end-of-marketing year stocks estimates will be made for canola and rapeseed as of June 1, and for safflower and mustard seed as of Sept. 1. Data will appear in the June 30 and Sept. 30 Grain Stocks reports.

—The June 1 flaxseed and Sept. 1 sunflower stocks estimates will include "all other States" and U.S. totals and appear in the Grain Stocks reports.

—Estimated season average prices for all crops and States added to the program will be included in the Jan. 23 Crop Values report.

—Colorado and Nebraska will be added to the sunflower estimating program and covered in the monthly Crop Production report.

—Sunflower and flaxseed mid-year estimates of planted acres will be expanded to include "other States" and the United States and will be carried in the June Acreage report.

Kent Miller (202) 219-0494

#

USDA ANNOUNCES FINAL RESULTS OF 10TH CONSERVATION RESERVE PROGRAM SIGNUP

WASHINGTON, Nov. 13—Deputy Secretary of Agriculture Ann Veneman today announced that producers signed contracts to place an additional 475,175 acres of land into the Conservation Reserve Program following the 10th CRP signup March 4-15. CRP contracts have now been entered for 34,397,740 acres.

The 475,175 acres were enrolled on 8,601 contracts which went into effect during the 1991 crop year.

Data from the 11th CRP signup July 8-19 are not yet available. It has been reported that 1.12 million acres were tentatively accepted as a result of that signup.

Bids for the 12th CRP signup will be accepted by county offices of USDA'S Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service June 15-26, 1992.

Veneman said enrollment trends are shifting away from the Mountain and Great Plains States toward the Cornbelt and other states east of the Great Plains.

"Many changes have been made to the CRP since the 10th signup including land eligibility criteria and processes that affect payment rates," Veneman said. "Because of these changes I strongly encourage those producers who earlier decided not to participate in the program to take another look at the CRP now."

The following table provides final contract information, by state, for the 10th signup:

	Number of Bids	Number of Contracts	Acres Contracted	Average Acre Rental Rate	Annual Rental Payment
U.S. Total	28,286	8,601	475,175	\$53.66	\$25,499,546
Alabama	621	343	16,487	44.35	731,214
Alaska	4	1	647	36.93	23,893
Arizona	1	0	0	0.00	0
Arkansas	266	103	9,144	47.16	431,194
California	64	0	0	0.00	0
Colorado	410	16	1,556	36.45	56,718
Connecticut	3	0	0	0.00	0

Delaware	5	1	11	59.09	650
Florida	233	66	2,338	41.06	95,989
Georgia	777	237	11,395	43.18	492,071
Hawaii	1	0	0	0.00	0
Idaho	242	82	19,551	45.02	880,124
Illinois	1,896	863	28,403	74.77	2,123,789
Indiana	1,063	476	14,917	75.89	1,132,028
Iowa	2,499	929	37,222	82.90	3,085,669
Kansas	1,880	135	8,812	52.13	459,392
Kentucky	316	161	6,761	58.45	395,201
Louisiana	179	74	4,782	43.28	206,957
Maine	32	9	278	49.76	13,833
Maryland	102	61	1,575	74.70	117,647
Massachusetts	10	0	0	0.00	0
Michigan	1,223	414	17,792	56.62	1,007,401
Minnesota	1,656	418	20,230	47.75	966,025
Mississippi	898	548	33,070	43.86	1,450,514
Missouri	1,127	521	32,867	62.47	2,053,103
Montana	1,126	132	49,167	35.31	1,736,240
Nebraska	1,587	290	10,521	61.37	645,647
Nevada	1	0	0	0.00	0
New Hampshire	1	0	0	0.00	0
New Jersey	1	0	0	0.00	0
New Mexico	22	1	29	32.45	941
New York	199	57	3,038	42.82	130,079
North Carolina	395	168	3,103	44.35	137,626
North Dakota	1,204	83	13,799	33.60	463,578
Ohio	1,125	504	19,267	71.11	1,370,074
Oklahoma	410	49	5,647	42.14	237,958
Oregon	76	10	2,736	45.71	125,063
Pennsylvania	367	60	1,952	57.44	112,123
Puerto Rico	1	1	15	75.00	1,125
Rhode Island	0	0	0	0.00	0
South Carolina	571	77	2,563	39.14	100,304
South Dakota	1,004	88	4,210	38.58	162,421
Tennessee	585	280	10,856	50.67	550,071
Texas	1,083	225	39,029	40.01	1,561,467
Utah	52	0	0	0.00	0
Vermont	1	0	0	0.00	0

Virginia	284	80	1,399	55.75	77,999
Washington	303	60	8,236	52.14	429,393
West Virginia	12	0	0	0.00	0
Wisconsin	2,296	978	31,770	60.88	1,934,025
Wyoming	72	0	0	0.00	0

#

